



United States Government
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
Washington, DC 20570-0001

November 3, 2015

Ryan P. Mulvey, Esq.
Cause of Action
1919 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite 650
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Mr. Mulvey:

This letter is in response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request dated September 28, 2015, seeking "a copy of any report or response, including attachments and exhibits, to the letter from Senator Johnson" to the Inspectors General requesting that they examine their respective agency's compliance with the FOIA requirements and the extent to which political appointees may have been involved with agency FOIA processes. This request was assigned a FOIA tracking number **OIG-2015-006**.

Our search revealed records consisting of four email messages from the Inspector General to staff of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs regarding Chairman Johnson's request. Those messages are provided to you in response to your request without any redactions.

In the email message dated June 24, 2015, from the Inspector General to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, we provided a copy of a 2012 investigation titled "OIG-I-473." You may recall that in 2012, Cause of Action submitted a FOIA request for records related to that investigation. In response to the 2012 FOIA request, we provided a copy of the investigative report and other related records to Cause of Action. In an abundance of caution, we included with this response all of the records related to OIG-I-473 that were provided to Cause of Action in 2012.

Although for purposes of FOIA the email messages that we received from the staff for the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs are not an "agency record," we included those messages with our responsive records after determining that nothing in the messages indicated that Congress intended to exert control over the information contained therein. See Paisley v. CIA, 712 F.2d 686 (D.C. Cir. 1983), vacated in part on other grounds, 724 F.2d 201 (D.C. Cir. 1984) (per curiam).

As indicated in the records provided to you, we initiated an audit in response to the request from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. That audit is currently ongoing. At this time, we are also providing to you a copy of the document that notifies that Agency that the audit was initiated and the scope of the audit. Once the audit is completed and a final report is issued, we will provide a copy of the audit report to you at the time that we post it on the Internet and provide it to Congress.

Mr. Ryan P. Mulvey

Page 2


November 3, 2015

In response to our request regarding FOIA processing fees, we determined that our review process resulted in what could be considered de minimis chargeable cost, and that the records should be provided without costs. As such, it is not necessary to determine your fee category.

I am responsible for the above determination. You may obtain a review thereof under the provisions of Section 102.177(c)(2)(v) of the NLRB Rules and Regulations by filing an appeal with the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, 1015 Half Street, SE, Washington, D.C. 20570, within 28 calendar days from the date of this letter, such period beginning to run on the calendar day after the date of this letter. Thus, the appeal must be received by the close of business (5:00 p.m.) on December 1, 2015. Any appeal should contain a complete statement of the reasons upon which it is based.

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(c). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "James E. Tatum, Jr." with a stylized flourish at the end.

James E. Tatum, Jr.
Counsel to the Inspector General

Enclosures

cc: NLRB FOIA Officer (w/o encls.)

From: Berry, David P.
To: "Ingram, Caroline (HSGAC)"
Subject: RE: Letter from Sen. Ron Johnson - Chairman, HSGAC
Date: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 10:21:00 AM

Ms. Ingram,

Is there a time today that we can discuss the request? There are two issues:

- (1) We completed an investigation in 2012 that is related to the issues raised in the request, and I wanted to give you some context to help you understand how that relationship exists before I send the report to you; and
- (2) While I think the request is a great idea and I am excited at the opportunity to address this issue, I don't know if I can collect the data and report back in 60 days. There has been a substantial amount of FOIA activity involving the Board and it's going to take some digging to find evidence of the involvement or to reach a level of comfort in determining that such evidence does not exist. Our efforts will also be hindered by the Hqs move that is occurring for about the next 3 to 4 weeks.

Thanks

Dave Berry
IG, NLRB
(202) 273-1964

From: Ingram, Caroline (HSGAC) [mailto:Caroline_Ingram@Exemption 6]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2015 7:13 PM
To: Berry, David P.
Subject: Letter from Sen. Ron Johnson - Chairman, HSGAC

Attached please find a letter from Senator Ron Johnson, Chairman of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. The original letter will arrive in the mail.

Please confirm receipt of this message and attachment.

Thank you,

Caroline Ingram
Counsel
Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Senator Ron Johnson, Chairman
202.224.4751 (Office)

From: Berry, David P.
To: "Ingram, Caroline (HSGAC)"
Subject: RE: Letter from Sen. Ron Johnson - Chairman, HSGAC
Date: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 12:33:00 PM

I available before 2 or after 4. I should be at my desk.

Thanks
Dave

From: Ingram, Caroline (HSGAC) [mailto:Caroline_Ingram@Exemption 6]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 12:02 PM
To: Berry, David P.
Subject: RE: Letter from Sen. Ron Johnson - Chairman, HSGAC

Hi Dave –

Happy to touch base with you. I am available to chat any time before 2pm, as well as anytime after 4pm. Let me know what time works best for you.

Thanks,
Caroline

Caroline Ingram
Counsel
Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Senator Ron Johnson, Chairman
202.224.4751 (Office)

From: Berry, David P. [mailto:David.Berry@nlrb.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 10:21 AM
To: Ingram, Caroline (HSGAC)
Subject: RE: Letter from Sen. Ron Johnson - Chairman, HSGAC

Ms. Ingram,

Is there a time today that we can discuss the request? There are two issues:

- (1) We completed an investigation in 2012 that is related to the issues raised in the request, and I wanted to give you some context to help you understand how that relationship exists before I send the report to you; and
- (2) While I think the request is a great idea and I am excited at the opportunity to address this issue, I don't know if I can collect the data and report back in 60 days. There has been a substantial amount of FOIA activity involving the Board and it's going to take some digging to find evidence of the involvement or to reach a level of comfort in determining that such evidence does not exist. Our efforts will also be hindered by the Hqs move that is occurring for about the next 3 to 4 weeks.

Thanks
Dave Berry
IG, NLRB
(202) 273-1964

From: Ingram, Caroline (HSGAC) [mailto:Caroline_Ingram@Exemption 6]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2015 7:13 PM
To: Berry, David P.
Subject: Letter from Sen. Ron Johnson - Chairman, HSGAC

Attached please find a letter from Senator Ron Johnson, Chairman of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. The original letter will arrive in the mail.

Please confirm receipt of this message and attachment.

Thank you,

Caroline Ingram
Counsel
Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Senator Ron Johnson, Chairman
202.224.4751 (Office)

RON JOHNSON, WISCONSIN, CHAIRMAN

JOHN MCCAIN, ARIZONA
ROB PORTMAN, OHIO
RAND PAUL, KENTUCKY
JAMES LANKFORD, OKLAHOMA
MICHAEL B. ENZI, WYOMING
KELLY AYOTTE, NEW HAMPSHIRE
JONI ERNST, IOWA
BEN SASSE, NEBRASKA

THOMAS R. CARPER, DELAWARE
CLAIRE McCASKILL, MISSOURI
JON TESTER, MONTANA
TAMMY BALDWIN, WISCONSIN
HEIDI HEITKAMP, NORTH DAKOTA
CORY A. BOOKER, NEW JERSEY
GARY C. PETERS, MICHIGAN

KEITH B. ASHDOWN, STAFF DIRECTOR
GABRIELLE A. BATKIN, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON
HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6250

June 23, 2015

Mr. David P. Berry
Inspector General
National Labor Relations Board
1099 14th Street, NW, Room 9820
Washington, DC 20570

Dear Mr. Berry:

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is conducting oversight of how Executive Branch departments and agencies respond to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests. The Committee recognizes the important role that FOIA plays in holding the government accountable to American taxpayers and seeks to ensure that government officials do not interfere with the FOIA process to inhibit transparency. Accordingly, as the Committee examines how departments and agencies comply with FOIA, the Committee is interested in learning about any involvement by non-career officials with the FOIA process at the National Labor Relations Board.

Enacted in 1966, FOIA bestows a right upon the American public to request records created by Executive Branch departments and agencies.¹ FOIA does not require requestors to articulate a reason for the request and creates a presumption of access so long as the request does not encompass any of the nine categories of information exempted from the statute.² This right of openness and transparency guaranteed by FOIA allows the American public to understand how their government is operating—a concept essential to perpetuate a flourishing democracy. FOIA, therefore, is a critical tool available to the American public to learn and understand how their government is acting on their behalf, as well as to hold the government accountable for its actions.

¹ 5 U.S.C. § 552.

² *Id.* at § 552(b). FOIA states that agencies may withhold the following nine categories: (1) information that is classified to protect national security; (2) information related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency; (3) information that is prohibited from disclosure by another federal law; (4) trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is confidential or privileged; (5) privileged communications within or between agencies; (6) information that, if disclosed, would invade another individual's personal privacy; (7) certain information compiled for law enforcement purposes; (8) information that concerns the supervision of financial institutions; and (9) geological information on wells. *Id.*

Just one day after taking office, President Obama issued a memorandum to all heads of Executive Branch departments and agencies emphasizing that openness and transparency are fundamental aspects of FOIA.³ President Obama stated:

The Freedom of Information Act should be administered with a clear presumption: In the face of doubt, openness prevails. The Government should not keep information confidential merely because public officials might be embarrassed by disclosure, because errors and failures might be revealed, or because of speculative or abstract fears. Nondisclosure should never be based on an effort to protect the personal interests of Government officials at the expense of those they are supposed to serve. In responding to requests under the FOIA, executive branch agencies should act promptly and in a spirit of cooperation, recognizing that such agencies are servants of the public.⁴

As described in the President's directive, FOIA is an essential tool vital to furthering transparency within government programs and operations. Department and agency personnel play an important role in ensuring FOIA requests are handled in a timely manner. In addition, Offices of Inspectors General (OIGs) across Executive Branch perform a critical role in providing oversight of agency operations and investigating allegations of misconduct related to the processing of FOIA requests.

Recent media reports indicate prior cases where non-career officials have been substantially involved in the FOIA response process. For example, during Hillary Clinton's tenure as Secretary of State, her staff carefully reviewed and scrutinized politically sensitive documents requested under FOIA—directly affecting what documents or portions of documents were ultimately released to requestors.⁵ Her staff's involvement in the response process led to delays, despite the Department's FOIA officer already having prepared and finalized responses for release.⁶ Additionally, in 2010, former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano's non-career staff was substantially involved in the Department's FOIA response process by implementing an intricate review and approval process for FOIA responses, including redacting potentially embarrassing information, which compromised transparency and accountability to American taxpayers.⁷ These troubling examples raise particular concerns as the Committee seeks to ensure Executive Branch departments and agencies are following public

³ Memorandum from Pres. Obama to Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, *Freedom of Information Act* (Jan. 21, 2009), available at https://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Freedom_of_Information_Act/ (last visited Jun. 23, 2015).

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Laura Meckler, *Hillary Clinton's State Dep't Staff Kept Tight Rein on Records*, WALL ST. J., May 19, 2015, available at <http://www.wsj.com/articles/hillary-clintons-state-department-staff-kept-tight-rein-on-records-1432081701> (last visited Jun. 23, 2015).

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Id.*; see also H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, *Staff Report: A New Era of Openness? How and Why Political Staff at DHS Interfered with the FOIA Process*, 112th Cong. (Mar. 30, 2011), available at http://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/DHS_REPORT_FINAL_FINAL_4_01_11.pdf (last visited Jun. 23, 2015).

records law and that non-career personnel are not adversely affecting the quantity, quality, and timeliness of information provided to the American public through the FOIA process.

In light of previous cases of involvement by non-career officials in the FOIA response process and the critical role that OIGs play in providing oversight of internal agency operations, the Committee wants to ensure that agencies are taking the appropriate steps to fully respond to FOIA requests without unnecessary delay, and that the involvement of non-career officials in the FOIA process does not result in less information being provided to the requestors than otherwise would have been provided. Further, the Committee wants to be sure that honest efforts by departments and agencies to respond to FOIA requests are not frustrated or compromised by the involvement of non-career officials in the FOIA response process.

In order to assist the Committee's oversight obligations, I ask that your office please analyze the involvement of non-career officials' involvement in the FOIA response process at the department or agency, if any, for the period of January 1, 2007, to the present. If non-career officials were involved in the FOIA response process, please analyze whether their involvement resulted in any undue delay of a response to any FOIA request or the withholding of any document or portion of any document that would have otherwise been released but for the non-career official's involvement in the process. If your analysis shows such a result, please provide the following information about each FOIA request:


- a. Contents of the FOIA request;
- b. Recommendation by the department or agency's FOIA officer as to what information should be disclosed in response to the request;
- c. Name(s) and position(s) of non-career personnel who were involved with the response process;
- d. Details and supporting documents related to the processing of the response to the FOIA request;
- e. Documents that were ultimately disclosed in response to the request; and
- f. Documents or information that would have been disclosed in response to the FOIA request absent the involvement of non-career department or agency personnel.

As part of your analysis, I request that you seek a written certification from the department or agency's chief FOIA officer that 1) no non-career officials were involved in the department or agency's response to any FOIA request or 2) if such involvement occurred, the involvement of non-career officials has never resulted in the undue delay of a response to a FOIA request or the provision of less information than would have been provided but for the involvement of the non-career officials. Please provide this certification to the Committee in conjunction with your analysis.

I respectfully request that your office perform this analysis and report back to the Committee within 60 days. If you have any questions about this request, please have your staff contact Caroline Ingram of the Committee staff at (202) 224-4751. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Mr. David P. Berry
June 23, 2015
Page 4

Sincerely,


Ron Johnson
Chairman

cc: The Honorable Thomas R. Carper
Ranking Member

From: Berry, David P.
To: ["Ingram, Caroline \(HSGAC\)"](#)
Subject: Emailing: Ex parte Report Transmittal _final_, NLRB OIG Ex Parte Rpt
Date: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 4:28:26 PM
Attachments: [Ex parte Report Transmittal _final_.pdf](#)
[NLRB OIG Ex Parte Rpt.pdf](#)

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

Ex parte Report Transmittal _final_
NLRB OIG Ex Parte Rpt

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
National Labor Relations Board
Office of Inspector General



Memorandum

November 19, 2012

To: Mark Gaston Pearce
Chairman

Lafe Solomon
Acting General Counsel

From: David P. Berry 
Inspector General

Subject: Report of Investigation – OIG-I-473

On April 13, 2012, we received a request from the Committee on Education and the Workforce to investigate whether the Acting General Counsel or his staff made prohibited ex parte communications regarding the Boeing case, 19-CA-032431. The request by the Committee included several redacted e-mail messages that had been provided to a Freedom of Information Act requester. Our investigative efforts included a review of those e-mail messages as well as other e-mail messages that have been provided through the Freedom of Information Act and in response to Congressional oversight requests. This report summarizes our findings with regard to that investigative activity.

Although we concluded that NLRB personnel did not engage in misconduct, we believe that the Agency's public affairs activities could benefit from more clearly defined policies and procedures. This recommendation is based on our general observations during the investigation and is not a statement that we believe that the Director, Office of Public Affairs, is responsible for our findings.


Attachment

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
National Labor Relations Board
Office of Inspector General



Memorandum

November 19, 2012

From: David P. Berry 
Inspector General

Subject: Report of Investigation – OIG-I-473

This memorandum addresses an investigation conducted by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) involving an allegation that ex parte communications were made by the Office of the General Counsel to Chairman Wilma Liebman in the unfair labor practice case involving The Boeing Company (Boeing), 19-CA-032431. As a result of our investigative efforts, we found that certain statements in e-mail messages from personnel in the Division of Advice and Region 19 infringed upon the statutory prohibition regarding ex parte communications to Board Members. We also found that these individuals did not engage in misconduct because the communications were inadvertent.

SCOPE

On April 13, 2012, we received a request from the Committee on Education and the Workforce to investigate whether the Acting General Counsel or his staff made prohibited ex parte communications regarding the Boeing case, 19-CA-032431. The request by the Committee included several redacted e-mail messages that had been provided to a Freedom of Information Act requester. Our investigative efforts included a review of those e-mail messages as well as other e-mail messages that have been provided through the Freedom of Information Act and in response to Congressional oversight requests. This report summarizes our findings with regard to that investigative activity.

FACTS

1. On April 20, 2011, Richard Ahearn, Director, Region 19, issued a complaint against Boeing in case 19-CA-032431. (IE 1)
2. According to Nancy Cleeland, Director of Public Affairs, on April 27, 2011, she notified Wilma Liebman, then Chairman, and Lafe Solomon, Acting General Counsel, that during the "State of the Union," a CNN television show, the host of the show repeated misstatements of facts that had been made by Senator Graham regarding the Boeing case. (IE 2)

3. On April 29, 2011, the Director of Public Affairs sent the below e-mail message to solicit guidance on how to get certain points across to the media:

From: Cleeland, Nancy
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 3:16 PM
To: Solomon, Lafe E.; Liebman, Wilma B.; Garza, Jose; Ahearn, Richard L.
Subject: CNN questions on correction

The CNN Sunday morning show has spent a lot of time this week looking into our complaint about last week's show, where they aired Sen. Graham and Candy Crowley repeated some of his remarks as if they were true. Now they're coming back to us with the other side's responses. I'd appreciate any input on these questions.

On #1, Boeing folks are still saying we're in fact making them close the SC plant because it was specifically built to assemble Dreamliners. What's the best way to explain this? They've done a good job of making it seem like it's a distinction without a difference.

On #2, they don't seem to think there's much difference between the NLRB issuing a complaint and ruling on a case. I can understand their confusion, but there is a big difference. Any thoughts about how to underscore that point?

[Portion of e-mail message redacted as not related to possible ex parte communication.]

4. Several minutes after the Director of Public Affairs sent the e-mail message, the Acting General Counsel replied with the below message and added certain Division of Advice personnel as recipients:

From: Solomon, Lafe E.
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 3:31 PM
To: Cleeland, Nancy; Liebman, Wilma B.; Garza, Jose; Ahearn, Richard L.; Kearney, Barry J.; Farrell, Ellen; Sophir, Jayme
Subject: RE: CNN questions on correction

As to 1, we want them to keep using the main line and the surge line building planes in Seattle; they can build even more planes in SC. Everyone agree?

5. When interviewed by the OIG, the Acting General Counsel stated the following: (IE 3)

a. It was his understanding that the Director of Public Affairs had an exchange of e-mail messages with CNN's producers, and the Director of Public Affairs was seeking guidance on how to deal with two issues relating to misstatements made by the show's host and a Senator who had appeared on the show;

b. He described the issues as involving the remedy they were seeking and the differences between issuing a complaint and a decision;

c. When he replied to the Director of Public Affairs, he was repeating what was stated in the complaint using everyday language rather than "legalese;"

d. His focus, at the time, was on providing assistance to the Director of Public Affairs, rather than communicating with the Chairman; and

e. He does not consider restating what is in an unfair labor practice complaint to be ex parte communication.

6. Paragraph 13 of the complaint states as follows: (IE 1)

(a) As part of the remedy for the unfair labor practices alleged above in paragraphs 7 and 8, the Acting General Counsel seeks an Order requiring Respondent to have the Unit operate its second line of 787 Dreamliner aircraft assembly production in the State of Washington, utilizing supply lines maintained by the Unit in the Seattle, Washington, and Portland, Oregon, area facilities.

(b) Other than as set forth in paragraph 13(a) above, the relief requested by the Acting General Counsel does not seek to prohibit Respondent from making non-discriminatory decisions with respect to where work will be performed, including non-discriminatory decisions with respect to work at its North Charleston, South Carolina, facility.

7. Ellen Farrell, the former Deputy Associate General Counsel, Division of Advice, replied to the Acting General Counsel's comments in an e-mail message that was sent to all recipients, including Chairman Liebman:

From: Farrell, Ellen

Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 3:49 PM

To: Solomon, Lafe E.; Cleeland, Nancy; Liebman, Wilma B.; Garza, Jose; Ahearn, Richard L.; Kearney, Barry J.; Sophr, Jayme

Subject: RE: CNN questions on correction

We agree with Lafe. We can also point out that the Co. has a backlog of orders of somewhere around 850 planes. So there is room for additional production. I would guess the response from Boeing would be that they can't get their supply chain to provide for assembly of more than 10 planes per month so, as a practical matter, they cannot increase their production capacity even if they have the physical space.

Does anyone find it significant that they have continued the construction in the face of the charge filed in March 2010 and an investigation and efforts to settle in which they were closely involved. They have known for over a year that there was a risk of a complaint issuing but chose to take that risk. We don't have a lot of information about how specialized the facility was a year ago and whether it could have been converted to some other use at that time. But this may be an argument that's too sophisticated for a CNN soundbite.

As to #2, it seems the problem is not so much distinguishing between the NLRB (Board) and NLRB (GC) – but distinguishing between a ruling and a complaint. A complaint is an allegation; a ruling is a finding. And no finding has yet been made.

8. When asked about her e-mail message, the former Deputy Associate General Counsel stated the following: (IE 4)

a. She did not intend for her e-mail message to be an ex parte communication, but rather intended it to assist in responding to the press;

b. She believed that the statements that were in her e-mail response had already been made publicly by Boeing or in some other public discussion; and

c. She acknowledged that her comments could be considered ““relevant to the merits of the proceedings (29 CFR 102.126(a))’ in the sense that they concerned the remedy to the unfair labor practice” and that they were made in the timeframe set out in the regulations.

9. Jayme Sophir, then the Regional Advice Branch Chief in the Division of Advice, responded to the comments of the Deputy Associate General Counsel in the following e-mail message:

From: Sophir, Jayme
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 4:01 PM
To: Farrell, Ellen; Solomon, Lafe E.; Cleeland, Nancy; Liebman, Wilma B.; Garza, Jose; Ahearn, Richard L.; Kearney, Barry J.
Subject: RE: CNN questions on correction

One further point on #1 ~ even if they built the SC plant specifically to produce Dreamliners, I don't think they've ever said that the plant couldn't be used to produce other kinds of airplanes. Its basically an assembly facility. And, in addressing the Union's argument that closing the surge line will necessarily impact employee jobs in Washington (even though there hasn't yet been any impact), they've told us that other kinds of planes could easily be produced in that facility instead. Why would it be any different at the South Carolina facility?

10. When asked about the e-mail message, the Branch Chief stated the following: (IE 5)

a. She acknowledged that in responding to the e-mail message that she addressed some substantive issues regarding the alleged violations that arguably should not have been shared with Chairman Liebman;

b. She believed the statements were shared with Chairman Liebman inadvertently in that she was not paying attention to the fact that Chairman Liebman was included on the e-mail thread; and

c. After the complaint issued, the Director of Public Affairs sent several similar e-mail messages seeking input on how to respond to the press, and it was unusual for the Director of Public Affairs to include the Chairman on such messages.

11. The then Region 19 Director also sent a response to the Director of Public Affairs that included Chairman Liebman as an addressee:

From: Ahearn, Richard L.
Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 3:55 PM
To: Cleeland, Nancy; Solomon, Lafe E.; Liebman, Wilma B.; Garza, Jose
Subject: RE: CNN questions on correction

#1 In the article you sent today Boeing expressed optimism that they could be producing (I believe) up to 14 Dreamliners per month. We are only contending that their decision to place the second line at a union facility was unlawful because that decision was motivated by a desire to retaliate. If they decided for non discriminatory reasons to place a third Dreamliner line outside of Puget Sound, we would have no issue with that. Moreover, they are now doing other work there which we are not seeking to stop and they can decide to locate additional work there, as long as for lawful reasons.

[Portion of e-mail message redacted as not related to possible ex parte communication.]

12. When asked about the e-mail message, the former Regional Director stated that: (IE 6)

a. Although he used "reply all" to respond to the request for input on how to respond to CNN, his primary intent was to communicate with the Director of Public Affairs, not the other individuals to whom his message was sent;

b. He was focused on responding quickly, because he understood that there were media deadlines; and

c. He views the first part of his message as a restatement of the language in the complaint itself and not an attempt to address the evidence in the case, and the second part of his message discussed procedural issues.

13. Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, Division of Advice, provided the following information: (IE 7)

a. After the complaint issued in April 2011, there was a discussion in the media concerning the complaint and the defenses raised to it;

b. He viewed the responses by the Director of Public Affairs to that discussion to be on behalf of the Acting General Counsel;

c. With regard to the e-mail message sent by the Director of Public Affairs, he did look at the messages in the thread, but did not focus on who was listed as addressees until the Chairman responded to a response by his Deputy;

d. He was upset by Chairman Liebman's response to his Deputy because he felt that it was an intrusion into a discussion about how the Acting General Counsel was going to defend his complaint in the media;

e. He believed that Chairman Liebman should not have been on the e-mail thread because it is not appropriate to discuss a complaint or defenses to it in front of a Board Member; and

f. If it had been an in-person discussion, he would have objected to Chairman Liebman's presence.

14. Chairman Wilma Liebman sent the below e-mail message in response to the e-mail reply by the Deputy Associate General Counsel:

From:	Liebman, Wilma B.
Sent:	Friday, April 29, 2011 6:24 PM
To:	Farrell, Ellen; Solomon, Lafe E.; Cleeland, Nancy; Garza, Jose; Ahearn, Richard L.; Kearney, Barry J.; Sophr, Jayme
Subject:	RE: CNN questions on correction

I am reluctant to get into this writing by committee. And probably I am too late, but I think Ellen misses the political point that is lurking here: the difference in re #2 is of course between issuance of a complaint and a ruling, but most certainly it is also about the complete independence of the General Counsel and the Board itself. If the reasons aren't apparent to each of you why that distinction is important, then come and talk to me.

15. Former Chairman Liebman provided the following information: (IE 8)

a. From her view, the issue was a matter of simply setting the record straight with regard to the difference between the General Counsel issuing a complaint and the Board making a ruling;

b. She wanted to make it clear that there had been no ruling by the Board and that the complaint was issued by an independent prosecutor and not the Board;

c. The notion of ex parte communication did not enter her mind and she was only focused on the issue involving the Board;

d. She had no discussion regarding the complaint with the Director of Public Affairs; and

e. She could not recall reading all the messages.

16. When interviewed, Nancy Cleeland, Director of Public Affairs, provided the following information: (IE 2)

a. She is the primary media relations person at the NLRB;

b. Although she reports directly to the Chairman, she also works with the Office of the General Counsel;

c. She sent the e-mail message regarding the issues with CNN's "State of the Union" show because she was seeking input on how to formulate a response to a CNN producer on the issues raised by the CNN show;

d. Her intent was not to solicit new information, but she wanted to come up with another way to explain the two points involving the remedy and the difference between a complaint and a decision because she felt that the prior statements were "not getting through;"

e. At some point in the discussion, she removed Chairman Liebman from the e-mail thread because someone expressed a concern about maintaining the separation between the Board and the General Counsel;

f. She could not recall who expressed concerns, except that it was not Chairman Liebman;

g. After she had removed Chairman Liebman from the list, Chairman Liebman responded to an earlier message, stating that she was "reluctant to get into this writing by committee;"

h. In the past, Chairman Liebman had expressed similar concerns to her about the inefficiencies of having a conversation with such a large group of people; and

i. At the time that she initiated her e-mail messages, she did not know what ex parte communications entailed or that there were any prohibitions on including both the Acting General Counsel and Chairman on the same e-mail chain.

17. Jose Garza, Special Counsel for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, provided the following information: (IE 9 & 10)

a. He reports to and provides counsel to both the Chairman and Acting General Counsel (AGC) regarding Congressional inquiries;

b. He does not represent or assist either the Board or the General Counsel with regard to unfair labor practice case-handling matters; and

c. He was provided with a copy of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Chairman Liebman and Acting General Counsel Solomon regarding the conditions under which he was to provide assistance to the Acting General Counsel in the Boeing case.

18. The following provisions were included in the MOU: (IE 10)

a. In providing such assistance to the AGC, Mr. Garza will be considered a “representative” of the AGC for the purposes of the Board’s rules prohibiting ex parte communications (Subpart P of the Board’s Rules and Regulations), and he will abide by those rules and this Memorandum of Understanding;

b. In providing such assistance to the AGC, Mr. Garza will report exclusively to the AGC and will not be subject to the direction or control of the Chairman; and

c. Mr. Garza will not communicate, directly or indirectly, with the Chairman, the Members of the Board, or their legal assistants regarding the substance of any information he may receive from the AGC or his representatives regarding the investigation and prosecution of the unfair labor practice case against The Boeing Company.

19. The Boeing unfair labor practice complaint was withdrawn on December 9, 2011. (IE 11)

ANALYSIS

We determined that, of the e-mail messages discussed above, the messages from Ellen Farrell, former Deputy Associate General Counsel, Division of Advice, Jayme Sophir, then Regional Advice Branch Chief, Division of Advice, and Richard Ahearn, former Regional Director, infringed upon the statutory prohibition on ex parte communication. We also find that the communications were inadvertent in the sense that they were not made with the intent to influence the Board. We also find that Chairman Liebman’s e-mail reply to the comments of the former Deputy Associate General Counsel does not evidence an attempt to influence the Acting General Counsel’s prosecution of the unfair labor practice complaint in the Boeing matter. Finally, we reach no conclusion with regard to whether an ex parte communication can also be privileged communication.

Section 4 of the Government in the Sunshine Act, P.L. 94-409, 5 U.S.C. 557(d), established a statutory prohibition on “ex parte communication relative to the merits of a pending proceeding between an agency decision making official and an interested person outside the

agency.” See H.R.Rep.No. 880, Pt. I, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. (1976), U.S.Code. & Admin.News 1976, p. 2201. The phrase “relative to the merits” was intended to be construed broadly and to include more than “facts and circumstances” that had been previously used in the Administrative Procedure Act. Id at 2202. The Board implemented this statutory prohibition through the following regulations:

No interested person outside this agency shall, in an on-the-record proceeding of the types defined in §102.128, make or knowingly cause to be made any prohibited ex parte communication to Board agents of the categories designated in that section relevant to the merits of the proceeding. 5 CFR §102.126(a).

The term *person outside this agency*, to whom the prohibitions apply, shall include . . . the general counsel or his representative when prosecuting an unfair labor practice proceeding before the Board pursuant to section 10(b) of the Act. 5 CFR § 102.127(a)

The term *ex parte communication* means an oral or written communication not on the public record with respect to which reasonable prior notice to all parties is not given . . . 5 CFR §102.127(b)

[The prohibition on ex parte communications is applicable to] [i]n an unfair labor practice proceeding pursuant to section 10(b) of the Act, communications to . . . members of the Board and their legal assistants, from the time the complaint . . . is issued . . . 5 CFR §102.128(e)

We agree with the characterizations by the Acting General Counsel that his message contains only a restatement of the remedy that is sought in the complaint. We determined that a restatement of the remedy sought in a complaint is not *relative to the merits* within the meaning of a prohibited ex parte communication. The complaint itself is a public document that is not a matter in dispute and restating the remedy sought is not, in and of itself, relevant to whether the remedy is appropriately warranted by the facts or law. This is particularly true when the communication is made in the context of a discussion of how to respond to what are perceived to be misstatements by the media regarding the remedy that a General Counsel is seeking. This type of exchange between the prosecuting and adjudicating arms of an agency of basic information that is contained in the document initiating the proceedings, particularly when engaged in overlapping functions such as media relations, would not normally threaten the fairness of a proceeding so as to rise to the level of a due process violation. See Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization v. FLRA, 685 F.2d 547, 566-67 (D.C. Cir. 1982). As such, we find that the e-mail message sent in reply by the Acting General Counsel was not ex parte communication.

In our view, the e-mail replies by the Deputy Associate General Counsel, Regional Advice Branch Chief, and the Regional Director are relevant to the merits of the pending Boeing matter. The statements of the Deputy Associate General Counsel not only provide factual information about the appropriateness of the remedy being sought, they provide a prosecutorial view of a potential response by Boeing. The reply of the Regional Advice Branch Chief only adds support to those arguments. As those matters are directly related to appropriateness of the remedy sought in light of what is described as a failure by Boeing to mitigate its possible losses, they would seem clearly relevant to the merits of the proceeding. In fact, Boeing later filed a motion with the Administrative Law Judge seeking, in part, to strike the remedy, arguing that the remedy was unduly burdensome. With regard to the e-mail reply by the Regional Director, in addition to restating the remedy sought

in the complaint, his communication also included factual information that was relevant to the merits of the appropriateness of the remedy. Whether this same information was available from other sources, such as media, does not relieve a communication of its status as being ex parte. *Cf. Railey v. Webb*, 540 F.3d 393, 411 (6th Cir. 2008) (citing *Johnson v. Carroll*, 369 F.3d 253, 254 (3d Cir. 2004)).

We do also find, however, that the ex parte communications by the Deputy Associate General Counsel, Regional Advice Branch Chief, and Regional Director were inadvertent in the sense that the purpose of the statements was to address the media issues rather than persuade a Board Member. In reaching that finding, we believe that the statements of Acting General Counsel and his staff that they were focused on responding to the media rather than communicating facts to a Board Member to be credible. We also considered the fact that the e-mail was initiated by the Office of Public Affairs in response to its concern with perceived misstatements in the media rather than by an office associated with prosecution of the Boeing case. We also believe that the MOU between Chairman Liebman and Acting General Counsel Solomon concerning the Special Counsel for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs demonstrates their concern that the Board not receive ex parte communications. Given that the ex parte communication was inadvertent, we also found no basis to conclude that these individuals engaged in misconduct.

From: Berry, David P.
To: "Ingram, Caroline (HSGAC)"
Cc: "David_Brewer@Exemption 6" "Rachel_Cook@Exemption 6"
Subject: RE: FOIA Response Contacts
Date: Wednesday, October 07, 2015 1:27:16 PM
Attachments: [Engagement Memo - FOIA.pdf](#)

Caroline,

Thanks for speaking with me about Chairman Johnson's request for information regarding FOIA processing. The attachment is the notification to the NLRB that we initiated an audit of the NLRB's FOIA program. The first objective of the audit should address the specific request for information. The second objective is part of our standard auditing procedures to test internal controls and data-base reliability to determine if there are deficiencies in the program.

I appreciate your working with me regarding several issues related to the oversight of the NLRB, and I hope that you enjoy your new position.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Dave Berry
IG, NLRB
202 273-1964

From: Ingram, Caroline (HSGAC) [mailto:Caroline_Ingram@Exemption 6]
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2015 11:11 AM
To: Berry, David P. <David.Berry@nlrb.gov>
Subject: FOIA Response Contacts

Hi Dave –

As I mentioned on the phone, David Brewer (David_Brewer@Exemption 6) our Chief Investigative Counsel, and Rachel Cook (Rachel_Cook@Exemption 6) will be handling the receipt of the FOIA responses from the IGs. Once your office has finished its review, please send the completed report to David and Rachel.

Once again, it's been great working with you. Please let us know if there is anything we can do to be of further support to your office's work.

Caroline

Caroline Ingram
Counsel
Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Senator Ron Johnson, Chairman
202.224.4751 (Office)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
National Labor Relations Board
Office of Inspector General



Memorandum

September 16, 2015

To: Richard A. Bock
Deputy Associate General Counsel

From: David Berry 
Inspector General

Subject: Freedom of Information Act (OIG-AMR-78)

This is to advise you that the Office of Inspector General (OIG) is initiating the subject audit. The objectives of this audit are to:

- Determine whether non-career officials were involved in the Agency's processing of individual Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests. If a non-career official was involved, determine the impact of that involvement on the processing of the FOIA request; and
- Determine whether the FOIA Tracking System is reliable and has effective internal controls.

We will begin this audit with an entrance conference on September 17, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. in the OIG suite. Field work is scheduled to be completed in December 2015, and a draft report is scheduled to be issued in January 2016.

This memorandum will be posted on the OIG page of the Agency's Web site until the report is issued. Please contact me or Robert Brennan on 273-1960 if you have any questions.

cc: Board
General Counsel